

charity. It serves our own national security and strategic interests for international borders to continue to actually mean something. It serves our own security and interest to impose massive costs on Putin's long-running campaign of violent imperialism. And it directly and powerfully serves our national interest to deter potential future wars of aggression before they start.

So, Madam President, I assure you that President Xi and the CCP are watching Ukraine carefully. There is a concrete reason why democratic Asian countries like Japan and Taiwan are rooting hard for Ukraine to prevail. Moreover, if we are stuck in a long-term strategic competition with China, we will want a stable, secure, and strong Europe on our side.

Speaking of America's national interest, our delegation also visited what we hope and expect will soon be the two newest members of the NATO alliance. We arrived in Stockholm and Helsinki just as the leaders of Sweden and Finland announced their nations will seek to join the alliance that has secured peace in Europe for more than 73 years.

It was an honor to have robust discussions with Prime Minister Andersson, Defense Minister Hultqvist, and key parliamentary leaders in Stockholm; and President Niinistö, Prime Minister Marin, Defense Minister Kaikkonen, and parliamentary leaders in Helsinki. I gave them my assurance as Senate Republican leader that I fully support both Finland's and Sweden's accession. I will do all I can to speed treaty ratification through the Senate.

Finland and Sweden are impressive and capable countries, with military capabilities that surpass many of our existing NATO allies. As new members, they would more than pull their weight.

These two nations' geographic locations are strategic. They have well-equipped and professional armed forces. Their military and high-tech industrial bases are robust. There is already significant interoperability that connects their defenses and NATO's. I will have more to say on this subject in the days and weeks ahead. Finland and Sweden would make NATO even stronger than it stands today.

Finally, it must be noted that our delegation was not the most important group of Americans shipping out to stand with our friends in Europe—not by a longshot. There are 100,000 American soldiers currently stationed in Europe to bolster the peace and shore up NATO. This includes the Kentucky-based V Corps.

And we received word just last week that 4,700 members of the 101st Airborne from Kentucky's Fort Campbell will also travel to Europe in the coming months. The Screaming Eagles have a long history of defending America's national security interests in Europe. I am proud of these brave men

and women for being ready to deploy at a moment's notice. I am proud America can make this peaceful contribution to our allies' sovereignty and strength in Europe, and I am proud of the entire Fort Campbell community for keeping these men and women well-prepared for this mission.

THE ECONOMY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, now on another matter, by early 2020, before the pandemic, Republican policies had helped create one of the best economic moments for working Americans literally in our lifetimes. Unemployment was low, inflation was low, and real take-home pay was rising steadily. In fact, we had wages rising faster for the bottom 25 percent of the wage scale than for the top 25 percent.

The incoming all-Democratic government was handed a reopening economy and a million vaccines going into arms per day. The country was packed with optimism and primed for a comeback. But through their far-left policy choices, Washington Democrats have driven our economy right into the ground. Inflation is setting 40-year records in consecutive months; gas and diesel prices have set new all-time highs on consecutive days; and sticker shock continues to cause headaches for Americans buying household essentials.

One college student in California said that buying groceries has him "taking extra loans to pay for my expenses. I'm maxing out my credit cards." A woman in Virginia reports she has taken to visiting three different food stores in one trip to make sure she is getting the best prices on everything she needs. A warehouse worker in New Jersey says she and her husband are spending more time hunting for coupons.

It's not a lot, but I'm trying to buy healthy things that also fill us up.

Overall grocery prices have jumped 10 percent in the past year, just one part of why many Americans say the Biden economy is not working for them. Fewer than one in four American consumers say the current economic conditions are even somewhat good, and fewer than one in five say the Biden administration's policies have done anything to help.

Democrats made runaway reckless spending their new normal here in Washington. So historic, painful inflation has become the new normal for working families everywhere else.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

ADDITIONAL UKRAINE SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2022—MOTION TO PROCEED—Resumed

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of a motion to proceed to H.R. 7691, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 368, H.R. 7691, a bill making emergency supplemental appropriations for assistance for the situation in Ukraine for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2022, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

H.R. 7691

Mr. PAUL. Madam President, today the Senate is considering a bill to give \$40 billion to Ukraine. This bill brings up the questions of both constitutionality and also affordability.

There was an essay written in 1867 that was published in Harper's Magazine. It was called "Not Yours To Give." It is the story of Davy Crockett as a Congressman in the late 1820s. Like most stories of that vintage, some will argue that the story is an accurate rendition while others may say it is apocryphal. The moral of the story, however, is incontestable.

Davy Crockett only served two terms in Congress, but on one day in Congress he was confronted with a bill to give money to the widow of a military officer. Davy Crockett arose and gave this speech.

Mr. Speaker—I have as much respect for the memory of the deceased, and as much sympathy for the sufferings of the living, if suffering there be, as any man in this House, but we must not permit our respect for the dead or our sympathy for a part of the living to lead us into an act of injustice to the balance of the living.

We have the right, as individuals, to give away as much of our own money as we please in charity; but as members of Congress we have no right so to appropriate a dollar of the public money.

Davy Crockett continued:

I am the poorest man on this floor. I cannot vote for this bill, but I will give one week's pay—

I will give my check for 1 week, and if every member of Congress were to do this, it will amount to more than this bill asks for.

When Crockett finished, there was silence, and, remarkably, the bill failed. When later asked for an explanation, Davy Crockett explained.

He said:

Several years ago I was one evening standing on the steps of the Capitol with some other members of Congress, when [we saw] a great light over in Georgetown. It was evidently a large fire. We jumped into a hack and drove over as fast as we could. In spite of all that could be done, many houses were burned and many families made homeless, and, besides, some of them had lost all but the clothes they had on. The weather was very cold, and when I saw so many women and children suffering, I felt that something

ought to be done for them. The next morning a bill was introduced appropriating \$20,000 for their relief. We put aside all other business and rushed it through as soon as it could be done.

Later in the year, when Davy Crockett was back in Tennessee, he ran into a constituent by the name of Horacio Bunce. Crockett asked him for his vote, and Horacio Bunce responded thusly. He said:

You had better not waste your time or mine. I shall not vote for you again.

Your vote last winter shows that either you have not the capacity to understand the Constitution or that you are wanting in the honesty and firmness to be guided by it because the Constitution, to be worth anything, must be held sacred and rigidly observed in all its provisions. The man who wields power and misinterprets the Constitution is more dangerous the more honest he is.

Horacio Bunce continued. He said:

No, Colonel, there's no mistake.

The newspapers say that last winter you voted for this bill to give \$20,000 to some who suffered from a fire in Georgetown. Is that true?

Congressman Crockett answered him:

Well, my friend; I may as well own up. You have got me there. But certainly nobody will complain that a great and rich country like ours should give the insignificant sum of \$20,000 to relieve its suffering women and children.

Horacio Bunce replied to Congressman Crockett. He said:

The power of collecting and disbursing money at pleasure is the most dangerous power that can be intrusted to man. . . . [W]hile you are contributing to relieve one, you are drawing it from thousands who are even worse off than he. If you had the right to give anything, the amount was simply a matter of discretion with you, and you had as much right to give \$20,000,000 as \$20,000. If you have the right to give to one, you have the right to give to all; and, as the Constitution neither defines charity nor stipulates the amount, you are at liberty to give to any and everything which you may believe, or profess to believe, is a charity, and to any amount you may think proper.

No, Colonel [Crockett], Congress has no right to give charity. Individual members may give as much of their own money as they please, but they have no right to touch a dollar of the public money for that purpose. If twice as many houses had been burned in this county [in Tennessee] as in Georgetown, neither you nor any other member of Congress would have thought of appropriating a dollar for our relief.

Bunce informed Crockett that if each Congressman had shown their sympathy for the fire victims by giving 1 week's pay, it would have nearly covered the cost, but it was easier simply to give other people's money.

Bunce continued:

The people about Washington, no doubt, applauded you for relieving them from the necessity of giving by giving what was not yours to give. The people have delegated to Congress, by the Constitution, the power to do certain things. To do these, it is authorized to collect and pay moneys, and for nothing else. Everything beyond this is usurpation, and a violation of the Constitution.

"So you see, Colonel, you have violated the Constitution in what I consider a vital point. It is a precedent fraught with danger to the

country, for when Congress once begins to stretch its power beyond the limits of the Constitution, there is no limit to it, and no security for the people."

Today, we are faced with a vastly greater sum of money than \$20,000. We are faced with \$40 billion to be gifted to Ukraine—a noble cause, no doubt; a cause for which I have great sympathy and support but a cause for which the Constitution does not sanction or approve of.

Now, we could ask, as Davy Crockett did, if each Member of the Senate would like to contribute individually to Ukraine, but, of course, that would simply serve to demonstrate the enormity of the gift. To come up with \$40 billion, each Senator would need to give \$400 million—not a likely scenario. It is much easier to spend such exorbitant amounts if you are spending someone else's money.

But even if the Senators won't agree to contribute their own money, surely we are a rich country and can afford it. Well, not exactly. The U.S. debt now approaches \$30 trillion. In the past 2 years alone, we have added nearly \$6 trillion in new debt. Inflation roars throughout the land. Grocery bills are punishing the working class and poor, and gas prices exceed \$5. Even before the pandemic bailouts, our country was running a trillion-dollar annual deficit just to pay for its routine commitments.

Putting aside the constitutionality of the \$40 billion to Ukraine, isn't there a more fiscally responsible way this could be done? What about taking the \$40 billion from elsewhere in the budget?

The United States spends more on our military than the next eight countries combined. Couldn't Congress simply shift over the \$40 billion and not add to the debt? If the defense of Ukraine is really in our national security interests, shouldn't the gift come from our military budget?

What about cutting wasteful spending? My office catalogued over \$50 billion in waste. I don't know about you, but couldn't we cut programs like the million-dollar study to see if taking selfies of yourself while smiling and then looking at these selfies later on—if that makes you feel good? Couldn't we cut the budget of the National Science Foundation that spends billions of dollars studying such burning questions as "Do Panamanian city frogs have a different mating call than country frogs?" Couldn't we maybe cut the \$2 million the NIH spent studying cafeterias to see, if someone in front of you sneezes on the food, whether you are more or less likely to eat that food? Couldn't we maybe cut the money spent on Japanese quail, studying whether or not they are more sexually promiscuous or not when you give them cocaine?

If we are not willing to cut the budget at all, couldn't we ask the American people to step up and pay a war tax? If this is really for our national security,

it should be very popular with the people. Why don't we offer to tax them in exchange for this?

Guess what. The American people don't want to cut spending anywhere in the budget—at least their representatives don't. They don't want to pay any taxes for this. They just say "Put it on my tab." But we have been doing that for decades, and that is why we have a \$30 trillion debt, and that is why we have roaring inflation.

If you want to pay for this with a tax, you could triple the gas tax. I am guessing that is going to be really popular and people really want to send this money so badly that they would be willing to triple the gas tax. If we were honest, that is what the people who are for this would propose. That would guarantee \$5 gas for the foreseeable future.

Alternatively, Congress could raise the income tax about \$500 for every American taxpayer. I am sure that would be popular. And for the people who think it is a great idea to send \$40 billion overseas, why don't they just be honest with people and tax them? Here is your bill, Mr. and Mrs. America, \$500 a taxpayer. Then it would be paid for. No, it is like everything else: Put it on our tab. Well, Uncle Sam's tab is full. It is complete.

To be clear, I am not for raising taxes to finance Ukraine's defense, but it is irresponsible to simply borrow more money. To borrow the money from China simply to send it to Ukraine makes no sense and makes us weaker, not stronger.

But let's be honest—most of Congress doesn't seem to care about the debt, doesn't seem to care how much money we shovel out the door and out of the country. Why? Because it is not their money. Every day, Milton Friedman's statement has proven correct—that nobody spends somebody else's money as wisely as their own.

I doubt the big spenders in Congress will ever consider spending any of their own money. But Americans across the land should sit up and notice and attach blame to these profligate spenders.

In the past 3 months, bipartisan majorities, Republicans and Democrats, have added over \$100 billion to the debt. Now these same big spenders are proposing another \$50 billion next week to bail out restaurants—restaurants that have been primarily injured by overzealous Democratic Governors and their edicts.

There are ramifications to this mountain of debt. Make no mistake, inflation is here, and it is rip-roaring and on the rise. Just as aiding the victims of fire in Georgetown during the days of Davy Crockett ignored the misfortune of the suffering people in lands too distant from Washington to be noticed, so, too, does today's deficit spending to be sent overseas ignore the pain and suffering and the inflation that is caused by that debt on everyday American families.

Inflation is simply an increase in the money supply. It comes from the Federal Reserve buying U.S. debt. M2 is a measure of the money supply. For the last 3 years, it has been going up at about a 15-percent rate. So we shouldn't really be surprised that there is inflation because inflation is an increase in the money supply. In January of last year, the annualized rate of the M2 expansion, the monetary expansion, was 27 percent.

No one should be shocked we have inflation. We have rising prices in the grocery store. We have rising prices at the pump because we borrowed too much money. We went heavily in debt, and the Federal Reserve is buying the debt. All this so-called free money floods the market and chases prices higher. Adding to our debt will only make the problem worse.

Yes, our national security is threatened—not by Russia's war on Ukraine but by Congress's war on the American taxpayer. The vast majority of Americans sympathize with Ukraine and want them to repel the Russian invaders. But if Congress were honest, they would take the money from elsewhere in the budget or ask Americans to pay higher taxes or, Heaven forbid, loan the money to Ukraine instead of giving it to Ukraine. But Congress will do what Congress does best: spend other people's money. I, for one, will not. I will vote no. Somehow, somewhere, a voice of fiscal sanity must remain vigilant, must remain stalwart and steady in a sea of fiscal madness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

INFLATION

Mr. REED. Madam President, soaring fuel prices are impacting every corner of the globe and hitting the pocketbooks of American families and businesses. Today, a gallon of gas costs \$4.52—nearly \$1.50 more than a year ago. From food to clothing to rent, growing transportation expenses are pushing already rising prices even higher.

Yet, while the American people are taking a hit, while the local mom-and-pop stores pay more for energy and goods, big oil companies are announcing giant profits. They have hit the jackpot.

Over the first 3 months of the year, ExxonMobil reported \$5.5 billion in profits, Chevron recorded \$6.3 billion, and Shell raked in \$9.1 billion—its largest quarterly profit ever. In just 3 months, these three companies made nearly \$21 billion in profits.

Now, robust profits are usually a signal for companies to invest in capital and labor and build the foundation for future growth, but Big Oil has different priorities. Rather than increasing business investment or production, these companies have almost uniformly pumped profits directly to their executives and wealthy shareholders.

In February, even before the Russian invasion of Ukraine sent gas prices skyrocketing, the Financial Times re-

ported that seven of the largest oil companies—including Exxon, Chevron, BP, and Shell—were expected to return \$38 billion to shareholders through buybacks this year, plus another \$50 billion in dividends. Big Oil hasn't hidden its strategy: Hold back production, and rake in the profits.

In a March 2022 survey, the Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas asked oil executives for the primary reason that publicly traded oil companies were restraining production despite high oil prices. The No. 1 answer they gave, reflecting the view of nearly 60 percent of those surveyed, was that it was "investor pressure to maintain capital discipline." To put it another way, they were saying that they don't want to produce more oil because more production will hasten the end of high oil prices and exorbitant investor profits.

Some oil company executives have been even clearer. Just last month, Chevron's chief financial officer confirmed that the company's top priority is its dividends, not investing in its business, and BP's CFO made similar comments during his company's first quarter earnings call—so much for BP's advertising campaign that it is investing in green energy.

Instead of resuming the production they cut in 2020, oil companies have kept output constrained, turning a 50-percent increase in prices at the pump over the past year into record-setting profits.

Make no mistake, our domestic producers have the capacity to produce more. Indeed, domestic crude oil output is below 2019 levels—that is right, domestic crude oil output is below 2019 levels—and over 12 million acres of leased Federal lands remain untapped.

My Republican colleagues are quick to try to weakly blame President Biden and "regulation" for lagging production, but that is not what the oil executives say. Look back at that Dallas Fed survey I mentioned earlier. Only 6 percent of the oil executives surveyed said that "government regulation" was the reason they weren't producing more. Sixty percent said it was higher profits. Six percent said it was regulation.

Now, I understand private companies are going to pursue high profits. That is business, that is free enterprise, and that is a competitive market. But when Putin and OPEC have outsized influence on the market, can we really call it a competitive market?

Look, the major oil companies can't control what Putin or OPEC does, but there is no doubt that Putin's war is taking their profits into the stratosphere.

And oil companies clearly think this is a great time for more dividends and more buybacks, not more production, lower prices, and giving the American people a break. In fact, just last month, Exxon announced it would triple its stock buybacks this year and next to \$30 billion. Thirty billion dollars is an astonishing number.

One of the things about buybacks is that they essentially raise the price of the company's stock. If you are an executive whose major compensation is stock options, you are giving yourself a huge raise, and that is part of this too. It is self-aggrandizement. It is something that does not square, I think, with the feelings of the American people and also the needs of the American people.

It is clear that the oil companies are not interested in helping Americans on their own, so the Federal Government needs to step in. We need responsible solutions that bring down prices and help families pay for the basics.

We must use every tool at our disposal. I fully support the President's pledge to release a million barrels of oil per day from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve to help stabilize volatile prices. One can imagine the price at the pump if the President was not doing this. It would be even further in excess of what is, I think, appropriate.

I have introduced the Food and Fuel Family Savings Act, which would provide most households with \$600 per person, specifically to cover higher gas and grocery costs this year. My bill would be fully paid for, targeted to those families making under \$80,000, and would also ease medium- and long-term inflation by crafting a fairer tax code. Instead of waiting for inflation to disappear, it would provide immediate and real help to Americans.

I have also joined my colleague Senator WHITEHOUSE in introducing legislation to return some of those windfall profits that oil companies are handing out as dividends and buybacks back to consumers.

These are important short-term efforts that will help Americans struggling with higher costs. But to truly lower costs in the long term, we must make the transition to clean energy and break our reliance on Big Oil and hostile foreign actors. I am proud that in Rhode Island, we are leading the way on offshore wind, a good renewable resource that when deployed will lower costs for consumers.

The bipartisan infrastructure law is also making key investments to advance this transition, including over \$60 billion primarily for new major clean energy demonstration and deployment programs.

The President has been calling for additional funding to enable this clean energy future. We need a package that includes tax credits and grants that would make clean energy, clean vehicles, and other clean technologies more affordable and competitive.

If we do these things, we will make ourselves less vulnerable to the whims of oil companies and cartels that depend on Americans paying more than they should. We will make our world cleaner, lower costs, and finally achieve the energy independence that we have wanted all along.

One of the many lessons of the past 2 years is that we cannot rely on oil for

plentiful, affordable energy. It is clear that allowing our energy needs to be held hostage by leaders like Vladimir Putin and organizations like OPEC is dangerous, but placing our faith in Big Oil is equally foolhardy given their preoccupation with profits over people.

As we battle inflation, it is the American people, not executives and wealthy shareholders, who should be the focal point of our energy and economic policy.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting policies that will help families now and in the future.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The majority leader is recognized.

BUFFALO, NEW YORK, SHOOTING

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, it has been a sorrowful, painful few days for the people of Buffalo, NY. Earlier today, I joined with President Biden, the First Lady, Governor Hochul, Senator GILLIBRAND, Buffalo's Mayor Brown, Attorney General Tish James, and other local officials to meet with families of those killed on Saturday, to visit the Tops supermarket where the shooting happened and to grieve with the community that has been ripped apart by unspeakable violence.

There is no single word to encapsulate what it was like to visit the Tops supermarket, to lay down flowers in honor of the dead, and to meet the families whose lives have been forever—forever—torn apart.

It was equal parts sorrow for the innocent victims we have lost. It was grief for the families who must carry on. Today, I met a young boy, only 3 years old, who lost his dad on Saturday because his dad was at the store buying his kid a birthday cake, just heart-breaking.

It was also with anger that somebody could act with such horrible evil. And yet, despite all that, it was hope. Hope that somehow, some way, this beloved community will find the will and the grace and the courage to cohere. I know, I know in my heart of hearts, that they will.

To the people in Buffalo I met today, I say this: All of New York and all of America stands with you in this hour of deep darkness. We love you; we hold you in our hearts; and we pray for each and every one of you. We will be with you in spirit at every prayer service and every march and in every moment of silence.

Today, we are all Buffalonians. I just don't know what could possess someone to bring violence to a place like the East Side. I just don't. But what we do know is that in each passing day,

new and frightening details emerge about the lengths to which the shooter planned his attack. We know that the shooter chose Tops supermarket in order to target as many Black Americans as possible.

It is a supermarket I know well. I helped bring it to the East Side decades ago because they were a food desert and needed a supermarket, and I persuaded the owners of Tops to open one. And as the years grew, that supermarket became not just a supermarket but a community convening place. And when this awful man went to Tops to do his terrible shooting, it was like putting a dagger in the heart of the community because the supermarket had really been much more than a supermarket.

And we know through online posts that the terrorist—that is what he could be called—likely visited the Tops market months ago in a reconnaissance mission to map out the store, to observe the security guards, and even to find a parking spot. We know all that.

We know that had he gotten away, he intended to carry out more shootings at another store.

And one other thing we know, we know that his reprehensible views—his racist, White supremacist views—belong to an extreme ideology of hate that is increasingly finding home in the American mainstream.

In Buffalo, the President was right to strongly condemn these views with the whole Nation watching. All elected officials—all elected officials—should do the same.

The “great replacement” or “replacement theory” used to be something that was found only in the darkest corners of deranged minds and in the deepest trenches of the internet. But today, sadly, indisputably, you don't need to go online anymore to find White “replacement theory” rhetoric. You can find it on cable TV from the comfort of your own couch.

And perhaps no network has had more impact in propagating and normalizing the rhetoric of “replacement theory” than FOX News.

To follow up from my remarks yesterday, this morning I sent a letter to Rupert Murdoch, to FOX News executives, and to Tucker Carlson, imploring the network and Mr. Carlson to cease their amplification of “replacement theory” on their network.

According to one study, Mr. Carlson has used rhetoric echoing “replacement theory” on at least 400 episodes of his show—400 episodes—which has an average nightly audience of 3 million people.

It is dangerous and un-American for one of the biggest news networks in the world to amplify conspiracy theories that are eerily similar to those cited by the Buffalo shooter.

And to those who think this is an exaggeration, to those who refuse to acknowledge that fringe White supremacist views are now increasingly out in

the open, I would simply ask them: Where were you on the night that thousands of White supremacists marched openly on the streets of Charlottesville, bearing torches and chanting, “You will not replace us”? That is what they said, “You will not replace us.”

Where were you when thousands of insurrectionists stormed into the Halls of this Capitol, waving Confederate flags and donning sweatshirts about the Holocaust?

Where have you been during any Trump rally, where the Republican standard-bearer goes on and on about undocumented immigrants stealing the 2020 election—a message parroted by countless MAGA Republican candidates across the country.

And where were you when White supremacists shot up a Walmart in El Paso, a synagogue in Pittsburgh, spas in Atlanta and a Black church in Charleston—or at a grocery store in Buffalo, NY?

It would be the easiest thing in the world to denounce something as evil and vile and un-American as “replacement theory.”

To its credit, this week, the Wall Street Journal editorial board acknowledged that “politicians and media figures have an obligation to condemn . . . such conspiratorial notions as ‘white replacement theory.’”

But while that is necessary, it is hardly sufficient, and too many MAGA Republicans refuse to do even just that.

And last night, Tucker Carlson did not do that either. He deflected and refused to acknowledge that a clear connection exists between the messages on his shows and some of the views championed by these mass shooters.

He dismissed the shooter's 180-page rant as the product of a “diseased and disorganized mind,” while omitting that the shooter's mind was diseased and warped precisely—precisely—by online conspiracy theories that are echoed regularly on his show.

The plain fact is that the shooter responsible for the violent murder of 10 innocent lives espoused the same false and racist conspiracy theories that Tucker Carlson has pushed to his audience 400 times and which far too many MAGA Republicans, including former President Trump, are happy to amplify.

Tucker Carlson and, indeed, all voices of influence in this country should come out and not just condemn racial violence, not just condemn racial theory but refuse to give these false and racist conspiracy theories a platform.

Let me say it again: Anchors like Tucker Carlson, and, in fact, all MAGA Republicans and all voices of influence across the political spectrum, should not just condemn racial violence, not just denounce White supremacist views like “replacement theory” but further refuse to give these false and racist conspiracy theories a platform whatsoever.

It is horrific to see that most on the hard right haven't done that to date.

Until we unite to stomp views like "replacement theory" out of existence, until we band together to call these vile conspiracy theories for what they are—White supremacist propaganda—we cannot find closure to the attacks like the one we saw this weekend in Buffalo, NY.

And communities across the country, especially communities of color, will continue to live in fear that at any moment they may be targeted by violence just because of who they are.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SOUTH DAKOTA STORMS

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, before I begin, I want to mention the severe storms that hit eastern South Dakota last Thursday.

I visited Castlewood on Saturday, which is among the communities that was hardest hit, to get a look at the damage, and it is extensive. Homes and a school have been damaged, destroyed. Many of our farmers were hit hard and lost critical equipment and buildings.

I just want our thoughts and prayers to go out to those South Dakotans who were affected and, in particular, the family and friends of the two women who were killed in the storm.

My office will be doing everything possible to help those affected get the assistance that they need to recover.

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

Madam President, this week is National Police Week—a time set aside to honor the service of our Nation's law enforcement officers and pay tribute to those who have made the ultimate sacrifice in the line of duty.

While there are a number of tough jobs out there, being a law enforcement officer is in a different league. I can think of only one other career path where willingness to lay down your life for your fellow citizens is part of the job description.

Law enforcement officers don't know what they will face when they get up every day. They don't know what they face when they respond to a call, but they go out anyway. We call, and they come, day or night, no matter the danger.

In addition to the physical dangers that they face, police officers also bear a heavy mental burden. Most of us don't have to confront evil in our lives every day, thanks in large part to the sacrifices of our Nation's law enforcement officers. But police officers have to get up close and personal with evil on a daily basis. They get a front-row seat when it comes to seeing fallen humanity, and they pay a price.

Being a police officer has always been a tough job, but over the past couple of years, it has gotten even harder. The "defund the police" movement and the anti-law enforcement sentiment have taken a tremendous toll on police departments and police officers.

Morale has sunk, which has resulted in increased resignations and retirements. Police departments are understaffed, which has stretched officers to the limit and limited their ability to respond to crimes. And, unsurprisingly, police departments are struggling to recruit officers.

Being a police officer is a difficult enough job as it is. It is not surprising that people would be reluctant to go into this field, knowing that the reward for their sacrifice will be constant criticism and vilification.

"Defund the police" rhetoric has also put officers in increased danger. I find it hard to believe that the 59-percent increase in murders of police officers in 2021 had nothing to do with the fanning of anti-police sentiment.

And "defund the police" rhetoric and soft-on-crime policies associated with it are taking a toll on public safety and contributing to the surge in violent crime that we have been seeing.

The "defund the police" movement is a movement that should have never gotten off the ground. It is based on a lie that America's law enforcement officers are evil and racist.

It is also based on the absurd premise that society can exist without the police or that police officers can be replaced by social workers and psychologists.

There may well be individuals who fall into a life of crime as a result of tough circumstances, but there are also a lot of criminals who choose evil deliberately, not because of a difficult past but simply for their own personal gain, whether that looks like money or power or revenge or violence.

And as long as we live in a world where people deliberately choose evil, we are going to need men and women who are willing to step up and confront that evil and do their best to ensure that the perpetrators face justice.

When the "defund the police" movement arose 2 years ago, the Democratic Party should have stepped up and denounced it. Instead, they equivocated, and some Democrats openly embraced "defund the police" rhetoric.

Now the President and other Democrats, perhaps motivated by poll numbers showing that Americans are seriously concerned about crime, are trying to distance themselves from anti-law enforcement rhetoric. But it is pretty difficult to take the President seriously on this when he has filled key administration posts with individuals who have spoken supportively about "defund the police" efforts.

Even the Vice President is on the record praising efforts to divert money from police departments.

"Defund the police" rhetoric needs to disappear from our public discourse.

We need to be making it clear as a society that policing is an essential job and that police officers perform an essential public service.

I am proud to support legislation like the Back the Blue Act, which would increase penalties for deliberately targeting a law enforcement officer and give officers new tools to protect themselves.

Police officers face the possibility of serious injury or death on a daily basis. The least we can do is to make sure that we are doing everything we can to discourage attacks on our law enforcement officers.

In addition to supporting legislation like the Back the Blue Act and the Protect and Serve Act, I will continue to urge the President to take action to secure the border.

Border security is not just something that affects border communities. Lax border security has consequences for the entire country. South Dakota law enforcement leaders and officials tell me that they are seizing drugs that they can trace directly back to the cartels that smuggle these drugs across the border.

We currently have a very serious fentanyl problem in this country. In fact, right now, fentanyl overdose is the leading cause of death for U.S. adults between the ages of 18 and 45.

And where is all this fentanyl coming from?

Mostly, it is being trafficked across our southern border. And there is no question that the worse the situation at the border gets, the easier it is for drug smugglers to evade detection and capture, which means more drugs flowing into our country and more of our law enforcement officers having to deal with the consequences.

In my job, I have the privilege of interacting with law enforcement regularly, whether it is members of the Capitol Police who protect Congress or local law enforcement in my home State of South Dakota. As a Senator, I have been in more than one situation where I have gotten to see up close what happens when danger threatens and law enforcement officers step into the breach to protect those in peril.

I am more grateful than I can say for all the men and women in South Dakota, in Washington, DC, and around the country who have made the choice to serve.

I am also tremendously grateful for their families. It is no small thing to say goodbye to a husband or wife or a mom or dad every morning knowing that there is a chance that he or she may not come home that night. No mention of the sacrifices made by our law enforcement officers would be complete without mentioning the sacrifices made by their families.

The mission statement of the police department in Rapid City, SD, is "Community First, Service Above Self, Integrity-Driven. One Interaction at a Time." Well, that definitely describes our Rapid City officers, and it is a pretty good description, I might add, of law

enforcement officers across South Dakota and around the country—community first, service above self. We are lucky to have men and women around the country who put their communities first and choose service above self, and I pray that we will always remember that.

Again, this Police Week and every week, I want to express my deep gratitude to the men and women of our Nation's law enforcement community.

Thank you. Thank you for putting your lives on the line every day to keep our homes, our families, and our communities safe. Thank you for your sacrifice, and may God bless you all.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 15 minutes prior to the scheduled vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATO

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, well, as has since been reported in the news despite our efforts to keep word of our travel somewhat under wraps before it was accomplished, this last weekend, Senators COLLINS, BARRASSO, and I had the honor of traveling to Ukraine with Senator MCCONNELL on a trip where we visited not only President Zelenskyy in the Presidential palace but also visited two of what we hope will be the next members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, namely, Sweden and Finland.

As we all know, it has been nearly 3 months now since Russia invaded Ukraine. There is no telling what President Putin expected. Perhaps he expected to be able to occupy Ukraine without firing a shot. But the fact is that the Ukrainians' spirit and will to defend their country remain unbroken and undaunted, and Putin's plans have failed and failed miserably.

We saw this firsthand when we had a chance to visit Kyiv this weekend. Before the invasion, Kyiv was a cultural, religious, and economic hub for the great country of Ukraine. Despite being damaged by Russia's failed attempt to seize the city and occupy Ukraine, Kyiv still embodies the Ukrainian will to survive against all odds.

When we were there, we met, of course, with President Zelenskyy and his advisers. They have done what I think we all hope we would do in the face of an unprovoked invasion, and that is to remain steadfast in dedication to your people and your country.

President Zelenskyy's leadership has inspired free nations and free people around the world. His unwavering commitment to Ukraine and its sovereignty has helped rally the rest of the freedom-loving world to come to the aid of Ukraine in a number of different ways. President Zelenskyy, of course, is a product of Ukrainian culture that values strength, resilience, a

love of homeland, and we know that the people of Ukraine are the same and certainly no different.

The Ukrainian people are determined not just to defend their country but to win in this fight against Russia, and that is what they have been doing. What they have asked of us is to give them the tools they need to fight their own fight.

Since the earliest days of this invasion, the United States has provided billions of dollars in military and humanitarian assistance, and we continue looking to President Zelenskyy so we can understand what more is needed.

This is not only a security crisis, this is a humanitarian crisis as well since Ukraine is known generally as the bread basket of Europe. He and his advisers warned us about the possibility of global food shortages caused by a Russian blockade of Ukrainian ports. This will lead to widespread famine not just in Europe but throughout Africa and spread the pain far afield from Europe.

When it comes to military aid, President Zelenskyy emphasized a message he has consistently shared with us: We need more, and we need it faster—more Stingers, more Javelins, more air defenses, more lethal aid.

Last week, President Biden signed a bill that I introduced along with Senators WICKER, CARDIN, and SHAHEEN, which was called the Ukraine Democracy Lend-Lease Act.

This legislation is rooted in the same lend-lease legislation that President Roosevelt signed into law in 1941 which allowed the United States to supply Great Britain and other allies with military equipment. At that time, President Roosevelt vowed to transform the United States into what he called the "arsenal of democracy," and the Lend-Lease Act helped accomplish that.

This legislation, the Ukrainian Democracy Lend-Lease Act, which has now been signed into law by President Biden, cuts redtape so we can quickly give Ukraine what it needs to win the war against Russia.

During our visit, President Zelenskyy shared with us the importance of this historic lend-lease program. We also discussed our commitment to helping Ukraine until they are victorious and encourage our allies and partners around the world to work with us—to continue to work with us to make sure that Ukraine has what it needs to defend itself.

Of course, we are now, as I said, just shy of 3 months into this war, and we know that we will be called upon to do more, but we all have a part to play in ensuring that Putin ultimately abandons as futile this mission to recreate the Soviet Union.

This week, as we know, the Senate will consider a supplemental funding bill to provide Ukraine with even more security and humanitarian assistance. I know there are some who disagree with more funding for Ukraine. To

them I would say, this funding, this support, this military and humanitarian support is not strictly an act of altruism on our part. We are doing this also because allowing Ukraine to defend itself is in our best interest. We can't kid ourselves by thinking that Putin would simply end with his brutal conquest of Ukraine or if he did, that he wouldn't start it up again in the near future. If Putin took Ukraine or a sizable portion of its geography, this would be just the next domino to fall in Putin's mad drive to try to cobble together whatever he can of the old Russian Empire, which would have extreme consequences for America and the rest of the world.

Even though Ukraine is not a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the outcome of this war will without a doubt have an impact on the United States and our NATO allies. An invasion of a NATO country would trigger article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty Alliance, which would require us to come to the aid and defense of a fellow member of that alliance.

Already Putin has made threats against Moldova, Romania, and now Sweden and Finland. His actions are an attack on the entire West and threaten peace and security around the world. It is literally a threat on the idea of freedom itself. Today, the frontline is Ukraine. Where that frontline will shift tomorrow is largely up to us and the Ukrainians.

Peace on the European continent is a peace fought for and won by the sacrifices of many who came before us. Obviously, we have experienced an unprecedented period of peace and prosperity around the world following the Second World War. Having experienced two world wars on the same continent over a period of 40 or 50 years, anybody in their right mind would look for ways to try to resist and reduce the likelihood of another war in Europe during our lifetime.

It was because of the sacrifices of our parents and grandparents that we have had this, what Bob Gates, the former Secretary of Defense, has called a holiday from history. Most of us have grown up knowing nothing but the peace and prosperity bought with the contributions and sacrifices of our parents and grandparents. But we now have our own responsibility, not only to our communities, to our families, and to our Nation to act in the face of this aggression, we have to contribute our part to the preservation of freedom and democracy around the world by helping Ukraine defend its freedom and its democracy.

Of course our support for Ukraine has costs, but every position will entail a cost. Of course, in this situation, the cost of the United States doing nothing, of simply turning over this democracy and our security and our economy to Putin, well, that is greater than any cost that could come by a supplemental appropriation that the U.S. Congress might make to assist

Ukraine. We know that world wars have been started by lesser action, and we must do everything we can to prevent this contagion from spreading beyond its current boundaries.

So what is at stake here is greater than the future of any one nation. The security of Europe is in question. The reach of Russia's aspirations to reestablish its former empire are as well. And we know that there are global repercussions however we choose to respond.

Of course, other adversaries of the United States are watching to see what we do. China, Iran, and North Korea are looking for any sign of weakness that would permit them to take advantage of that weakness to do something similar to what Putin is doing. We cannot show these authoritarian governments or their leaders any weakness that might encourage them to replicate Putin's unprovoked aggression.

While abroad, as I said, we visited with the leadership of Finland and Sweden at a pivotal and historic time for them. Both countries have historically been nonaligned with any warring power, but they realize the imminent threat of this invasion of Ukraine, what that means to them and their safety and their security. Both countries are now in the process of applying for membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and I am pleased to see that they will move forward with that decision and are as I speak.

Adding them to this alliance which has produced the longest unbroken period of peace and security of any treaty that the United States has been a part of, their participation will give the United States crucial partners in Scandinavia and in the High North and in the Arctic region, and it will nearly double the land border Russia shares with NATO countries.

You know, it is ironic that Putin said that one reason he invaded Ukraine is he did not want Ukraine to become part of NATO. He didn't want NATO on his border. Well, thanks to his missteps and miscalculation, now he will find Finland, with an 830-mile border, a member of NATO and on the Russian border—exactly what he said he hoped to avoid.

Now, I applaud the parliaments of both Sweden and Finland for breaking with their longstanding provisions of neutrality in order to serve the best interests of their people and to contribute to the collective security of Europe. Sweden and Finland will be much safer thanks to this bold decision by their governments, and they will certainly add value to NATO and enhance the deterrence of this collective defense agreement known as the North Atlantic Treaty alliance.

During our meetings, I told our colleagues, our parliamentarians from Sweden and Finland, that I backed their accessions unequivocally. Both of these countries have seen and acted on a major lesson from Putin's invasion of Ukraine: Putin does not honor inter-

nationally agreed-upon borders no matter what the cost. Sweden and Finland both have robust, well-resourced militaries, and I look forward as one Senator to welcoming them into NATO, and I hope all of our colleagues will agree with that when the time comes.

I am grateful to Leader MCCONNELL for putting together this past week-end's trip. I found it enormously educational, and I think it sent a great message, not only to President Zelenskyy and the Ukrainian people that we will continue to support them, whether it is with lethal aid or humanitarian assistance, but, likewise, I think it sent a message to our impending additions to NATO—Sweden and Finland—that we will support their addition to NATO when the time comes here in the U.S. Senate.

Lastly, I want to share a message from Ukraine. President Zelenskyy asked us, as Representatives of our various States and the American people, to convey to the American people his personal thanks and gratitude for supporting them during this existential fight with Russia. We, in turn, thanked President Zelenskyy for showing the world what one country and what one inspired leader can do to rally the cause of freedom and democracy and nonaggression around the world.

President Zelenskyy and the Ukrainians have changed the course of history for the better, and we unequivocally are with the Ukrainian people in their fight to remain a sovereign democracy.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURPHY). Under the previous order, all post-cloture time has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the motion to proceed.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 88, nays 11, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 178 Leg.]

YEAS—88

Baldwin	Cruz	Kennedy
Barrasso	Daines	King
Bennet	Duckworth	Klobuchar
Blumenthal	Durbin	Lankford
Blunt	Ernst	Leahy
Booker	Feinstein	Lujan
Brown	Fischer	Manchin
Burr	Gillibrand	Markey
Cantwell	Graham	McConnell
Capito	Grassley	Menendez
Cardin	Hassan	Merkley
Carper	Heinrich	Moran
Casey	Hickenlooper	Murkowski
Cassidy	Hirono	Murphy
Collins	Hoeven	Murray
Coons	Hyde-Smith	Ossoff
Cornyn	Inhofe	Padilla
Cortez Masto	Johnson	Peters
Cotton	Kaine	Portman
Cramer	Kelly	Reed

Risch	Scott (SC)	Toomey
Romney	Shaheen	Warner
Rosen	Shelby	Warnock
Rounds	Sinema	Warren
Rubio	Smith	Whitehouse
Sanders	Stabenow	Wicker
Sasse	Sullivan	Wyden
Schatz	Tester	Young
Schumer	Thune	
Scott (FL)	Tillis	

NAYS—11

Blackburn	Hagerty	Marshall
Boozman	Hawley	Paul
Braun	Lee	Tuberville
Crapo	Lummis	

NOT VOTING—1

Van Hollen

The motion was agreed to.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 798, Jennifer Louise Rochon, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York.

Charles E. Schumer, Cory A. Booker, Tammy Baldwin, Patrick J. Leahy, Patty Murray, Tina Smith, Sheldon Whitehouse, John W. Hickenlooper, Gary C. Peters, Benjamin L. Cardin, Jeanne Shaheen, Jon Tester, Richard J. Durbin, Catherine Cortez Masto, Mazie Hirono, Amy Klobuchar, Maria Cantwell.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Jennifer Louise Rochon, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Mr. ROSEN) and the Senator from Maryland (Ms. VAN HOLLEN) are necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 51, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 179 Leg.]

YEAS—51

Baldwin	Graham	Murphy
Bennet	Hassan	Murray
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Ossoff
Booker	Hickenlooper	Padilla
Brown	Hirono	Peters
Cantwell	Kaine	Reed
Cardin	Kelly	Sanders
Carper	King	Schatz
Casey	Klobuchar	Schumer
Collins	Leahy	Shaheen
Coons	Lujan	Sinema
Cortez Masto	Manchin	Smith
Duckworth	Markey	Stabenow
Durbin	Menendez	
Feinstein	Merkley	
Gillibrand	Murkowski	